

PATENT APPLICATION

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 2143**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Taro TERAO

Group Art Unit: 2143

Application No.: 10/658,810

Examiner: M. FEARER

Filed: September 10, 2003

Docket No.: 117127

For: INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM FOR HOLDING AND PROVIDING INFORMATION AS PROCESSING OBJECTS THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH CHARACTERISTIC VALUES (AS AMENDED)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the February 6, 2008 Office Action, the period for reply being extended by the attached Petition for Extension of Time, please consider the following remarks.

Claims 3-14 are pending.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to applicant's representative, Mr. Paul Tsou, during the June 5 personal interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

The Office Action rejects claims 3-6 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Farber et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0052884) in view of Laborde et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105811); and claims 7-8 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Farber in view of Laborde and further in view of Burgess (U.S. Patent No. 7,284,243). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action admits that Farber fails to disclose a method of calculating second characteristic values based on the data fragments, but asserts that Laborde discloses multiple data stores wherein one or more attribute values may be stored in the second data store. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not provide a rationale for why Laborde supplies the subject matter missing from Farber.

As discussed during the interview, Laborde merely discloses a technical data management system where various measurement data may be stored. There is nothing in Laborde relating to calculating True Names disclosed in Farber or second characteristic values recited in the claims. While Laborde may possibly be viewed as storing disparate data in different holding storage areas, this appears to be irrelevant relative to the subject matter admitted to be missing in Farber. Thus, there is no rationale for combining Laborde with Farber and, even if combined, Farber and Laborde, individually or in combination, would not have disclosed or suggested the subject matter recited in claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10.

The Office Action asserts that Farber discloses dividing a piece of data into a sequence of data fragments, each having a predetermined size citing paragraph [0152]. However, as discussed during the interview, Farber does not disclose dividing a piece of data into a sequence of data fragments, each having a predetermined size. Thus, Farber does not disclose and would not have suggested any subject matter relating to dividing the data items into a sequence of data fragments having a predetermined size, as recited in claims 3, 5, 9 and 10.

Further, Farber discloses nothing regarding whether to store a data fragment or a second characteristic value based on size as recited in claims 5, or a providing unit that provides respective second characteristic values contained in a second characteristic value set to a requestor, as recited in claim 6.

With respect to claim 7, the Office Action admits that Farber and Laborde does not disclose a holding unit that holds information for specifying a calculation method of the characteristic value but asserts that Burgess discloses such subject matter citing col. 2, lines 1-14. However, as discussed during the interview, here, Burgess merely discloses determining whether content of a cache copy of the data object is the same as the content of the server copy by using techniques such as check sums, message digests or hash functions. Burgess does not disclose and would not have suggested anything regarding specifying a calculation method of the characteristic value. Additionally, Burgess does not disclose and would not have suggested anything regarding second characteristic values. Thus, Farber, Laborde and Burgess individually or in combination does not disclose and would not have suggested the subject matter recited in claims 3, 9 and 10.

In view of the above, Farber, Laborde and Burgess, individually or in combination, do not disclose and would not have suggested the subject matter recited in claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10. Claims 4, 7 and 8 depend from claim 3, claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 9 and claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10. Thus, Farber, Laborde and Burgess, individually or in combination, do not disclose and would not have suggested the subject matter recited in claims 3-14. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 3-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Paul Tsou
Registration No. 37,956

JAO:PT/eks

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 6, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--